



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,503	12/17/2001	Jeffrey K. Reinemann	10559-540001/P12560	4314
20985	7590	12/14/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081			FISCHETTI, JOSEPH A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/024,503	REINEMANN, JEFFREY K.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph A. Fischetti	3627

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of claims 1-9 in the reply filed on 11/30/04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 10-26 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Blumenau et al.

Blumenau et al. disclose a method of managing resources among networked processors 22,23,21,20 that include a host processor 22,23.. and a remote processor 21. Blumenau et al. disclose a host activity monitoring facility 62 which reads on collecting accounting information at each of the networked processors to monitor utilization of the resources; releasing a local resource (local resource is read as the switch flow through the host ports) controlled by the host processor to the remote

processor (remote processor is read as the switch control 55 which controls the switch functions of the hosts 22'-25'), col. 7 lines 61,62 disclose monitoring frequencies of the host to balance usage, the frequencies being a fixed range is read as a predetermined upper threshold and thus reads on "the utilization of the local resource maintained within a pre-determined upper threshold configured by an authorized user"; and col. 7 line 59 discloses a dynamic balancing facility which computes a new list of host controls on the switches bad upon inter alia frequency threshold, which reduces the availability of the local resource to the remote processor by the host processor.

Re claims 2,8: col. 7 lines 63 et seq. a specified priority level is assigned to each of the hosts thereby answering the limitation of negotiating because prioritization inherently requires negotiations; the loop ports of the hosts 24,25 are read as an amount of the local resource and the switch 40 is read as an amount of a remote resource; and since the activity e.g. releasing into service of the switch is proportional to that of the loop ports, there is read an exchange therebetween.

Re claim 3, 5: Since the utilization of one host loop port might be exclusive of another's, this occurrence is read as substantially different in time.

Re claim 4, 6: the another resource is read as the balancing facility 63 of the computer which is read as the centralized location.

Re claim 9: the user defined condition is read as the access of hosts to storage.

Re claim 7: col. lines 13 et seq. discuss trying a port to determine if it is busy and if so then rerouting data until the first port is freed which is read as form of credit which is redeemed once the port frees up.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to PRIMARY EXAMINER Joseph A. Fischetti at telephone number (703) 305-0731.

JF